1	wasn't going to go forward, you sell, you
2	split up the money, and you're done.
3	Q So in the view of both you and
4	Chandu Patel at that point, Matt really hadn't
5	done anything towards operating during from
6	when he got the licenses up to that point?
7	A No. And so
8	Q Did that I'm sorry. Go ahead.
9	A That was the issue. What's the
10	company going to do? And you asked me what,
11	you know, Chandu's view was, and Chandu's view
12	was, if you're not going to go ahead and do
13	this, you sell, and give me my money. And
14	that's it. It's just all business. He was
15	disappointed, probably, and the meetings that
16	we had reflected that. But he's a big boy.
17	And you know, he'd still make a profit and
18	move on.
19	Q And did that ever change, that
20	situation where you felt that Mr. Austin
21	hadn't made any real progress, or didn't have
22	any real intent towards, you know, creating an

1	operating system?
2	A I don't understand your question.
3	Q Did your feeling that, the feeling
4	that you've just told us you had in 2003, had
5	that changed, or did it change over the period
6	of time you were associated with Preferred?
7	A Didn't change at all.
8	MR. SILVA: You know, I'd like to
9	clarify that a little bit. There were
10	actually two questions. Whether he intended
11	and whether he in fact accomplished, and you
12	know, I think just to clarify, he ought to
13	answer those questions separately.
14	MR. OSHINSKY: Well, I thought he
15	did answer, and I'm satisfied with the answer.
16	MR. SILVA: All right.
17	THE WITNESS: Let me make sure I
18	understand. Okay. You're saying, is it my
19	perception of
20	MR. OSHINSKY: Yes, that's exactly
21	what I said. What was your you gave me
22	your perception in 2003, and I just asked you

1 .	whether your perception had ever changed.
2	THE WITNESS: No. Never changed.
3	MR. OSHINSKY: That's really all I
4	asked.
5	BY MR. OSHINSKY:
6	Q Is there any essential difference
7	between PAI, the subsidiary, and Preferred, in
8	terms of either operation, or in terms of
9	selling of stock, or offerings? Anything like
10	that? Are they essentially one company?
11	A Well, Preferred Acquisitions, Inc.
12	won the geographic licenses in auction 34, and
13	holds, still holds all the licenses.
14	Q But in terms of an operating
15	business
16	A No. I would say, you know,
17	Preferred is the holding company, and if
18	properly organized, it's going to look like
19	most wireless companies. You're going to have
20	a holding company, you're going to have an
21	operating subsidiary, you're going to have
22	and these will hold the licenses separately,

1	by area, geographical area. You might have a
2	finance subsidiary. You know. It hasn't done
3	those things yet, but it certainly should, if
4	it were going to build and operate systems.
5	MS. SINGH: How about, let's put it
6	this way, if I may. In terms of what
7	employees did at PCSI or consultants did at
8	PCSI, what you would have done during your
9	time there, would the work that you've done
10	for PCSI have been separate from any employees
11	or contractors or other people doing work for
12	PAI? Or did the employees and consultants for
13	these two entities overlap?
14	THE WITNESS: I think it was all
15	just Preferred.
16	MS. SINGH: It was all just
17	Preferred?
18	THE WITNESS: To my knowledge,
19	nobody did anything for PAI separately from
20	Preferred.
21	MS. SINGH: Okay. Thank you.
22	MR. OSHINSKY: Actually, that's

1	exactly my question, too. Give me just a
2	moment here.
3	BY MR. OSHINSKY:
4	Q Had you been involved in the
5	acquisition of auction licenses before Auction
6	34?
7	A No.
8	Q And so all of your experience with
9	wireless licenses before, acquiring wireless
10	licenses before that came from acquiring
11	aftermarket licenses?
12	A Or filing applications.
13	Q Or filing applications.
14	A Yes, sir. That was the first time,
15	and basically, none of us knew anything about
16	it except Chandu. He taught us he tried to
17	explain to us how it was going to work, and
18	what we should watch out for, and so forth.
19	Q This is in Auction 34?
20	A Yes, sir.
21	Q And do you know who actually
22	created the forms that were filed in Auction

1	34 for Preferred?
2	A I was in the Palm Springs office
3	when they were doing that. It was Michelle on
4	the phone with David Kaufman.
5	Q Okay. And so do you know which one
6	of them actually created the finished form
7	that was filed?
8	A My perception was, and I don't
9	know, you know, firsthand, but my perception
10	was that David Kaufman either wrote the words,
11	or he, on a speaker-phone just, you know, he
12	said the words and Michelle, you know, typed
13	them in on the computer. The actual content
14	came from Kaufman, one way or the other.
15	Q Okay. And who did the actual
16	filing?
17	A Michelle.
18	Q And is that true for the 175, 601 -
19	_
20	A Yes.
21	Q and 602?
22	A Yes. She would have been the only

1	possible person to do it.
2	Q Why is that?
3	A She was the only one I know that
4	was involved in the 175 with Kaufman, and
5	nobody else was in the office when the 602 was
6	filed. Everybody else was in Puerto Rico at
7	the time. We were all in San Juan. She was
8	the only one back in the office.
9	Q And was this the trip where you had
LO	ventured outside of your probation and
L1	A No. This was another trip,
L2	actually. Yes.
L3	Q Are you familiar with the Bureau's
4	two letters of inquiry that they issued to
L5	Preferred?
L6	A I'm aware that now I'm aware of
L7	it. I wasn't aware at the time. No, sir.
L8	Q So were you aware of the first one
L9	in June of 2006?
20	A I was told on the phone, by Matt,
21	he'd received something. And then I was still
22	in Texas. And he called up Paul Besozzi at
	1

1	Patton Boggs, and they were talking about it,
2	and I was there, briefly, and I tried to make
3	a contribution, and I was told just to
4	basically shut up and get out of there, so I
5	shut up and got out of there.
6	Q What contribution were you trying
7	to make?
8	A Well, I was trying to they were
9	talking about things that might be possible
10	problems, and I was trying to alert Mr.
11	Besozzi to something I thought might be a
12	possible problem.
13	Q Can you tell us what that was?
14	A I'd rather not do that. But just
15	my perception of things.
16	Q Well, I'm asking you for your
17	opinion, and you are supposed to answer unless
18	it involves an area that's privileged.
19	MR. SILVA: Well, it does involve
20	the privilege, in a sense. Besozzi
21	MR. OSHINSKY: So are you
22	instructing him not to answer?

1	MR. SILVA: I'm just saying, and
2	you're asking him about a conversation he had
3	with the Preferred's attorneys.
4	MR. OSHINSKY: No, no. I'm not
5	asking about
6	MR. SILVA: Paul Besozzi was the
7	attorney, wasn't he?
8	MR. OSHINSKY: He said he had some
9	opinions that he wanted to share with them and
10	he was not given license to share those
11	opinions. And I'm asking him what those
12	opinions were. They were not communicated.
13	Therefore, there's no attorney privilege
14	involved. So I have to tell you Mr. Waugh, I
15	understand, you may be reluctant to share your
16	opinions, but unless it's an area that your
17	attorney's instructing you not to answer
18	because of privilege, you are supposed to
19	answer.
20	THE WITNESS: Well
21	MR. OSHINSKY: Could you give me,
22	very briefly, what your concerns were, just

1 briefly. 2 THE WITNESS: I was concerned about 3 how Matt was characterizing certain activities and relationships with the attorney. Ι 4 5 thought he should have told him something 6 different than he was telling them. BY MR. OSHINSKY: 7 it have to do 8 0 Does with your 9 relationship Preferred with or your 10 relationship with Mr. Austin? My relationship with Preferred. 11 12 Can you tell us what was 13 preference. 14 Α Well, let me put it this way. In 15 dealing with attorneys, particularly when you 16 have a fairly serious matter, my view is you 17 tell them everything, you let the attorney 18 figure out what to do with the information, 19 and I didn't see that that was necessarily 20 occurring like I would -- in other words, what 21 Matt was doing wouldn't be what I was doing,

if I were in a position to make decisions.

1	So I was trying to interject and
2	Matt told me that I couldn't do that. Does
3	that make sense? Telecellular, Inc.
4	Q Yes, that makes sense.
5	A If you're going to hire someone to
6	represent you, they need to be able to do
7	that.
8	Q Know the facts.
9	A Yes.
10	Q Okay. Were you ultimately involved
11	with either providing documents or information
12	for that first letter of inquiry in June 2006?
13	A No.
14	Q You were completely cut out of
15	that?
16	A I didn't I barely knew that it
17	was going on, and I wasn't at the time that
18	was occurring, I was asked to go out to
19	Fresno, California, and be involved in some
20	marketing activities.
21	Q I was just going to ask you what
22	you

1	A So I was sent around to do that,
2	and that's I didn't have any involvement in
3	responding to it.
4	Q Did you get the feeling that you
5	were being sent away?
6	A Well, I had the feeling I wasn't
7	going to be participating in responding to
8	that letter of inquiry. Let's put it that
9	way.
10	Q And what about the the same
11	question for the second letter of inquiry in
12	December. Were you aware of that?
13	A Matt called me. He was in he
14	was actually in Arizona at the time with Mr.
15	Ryan, Charles Ryan, another attorney, and
16	there were some questions that you all had
17	asked that required, were about me, or
18	something that I had done personally, or
19	something.
20	So he asked me to draft up some
21	responses and send them to him, and I drafted
22	up the responses and sent them to him, and

1	that was it.
2	Q And that was in December of two
3	thousand
4	A January. It was January, like
5	early January 2007.
6	Q But as you understood, it was in
7	relation to that second letter?
8	A Yes.
9	Q Okay.
10	A That was my only involvement. What
11	they did with my responses, I don't
12	Q Did your responses involve
13	documents to be produced?
14	A No. It was actually just a draft
15	of like an answer, kind of thing.
16	Q Okay. And was the request from Mr.
17	Austin or from the attorney?
18	A It was from Matt. They didn't
19	think they could answer those those items.
20	Q So they needed the information?
21	A Yes.
22	Q All right. Give me another second

1	here. And can you tell us a little bit about -					
2	- strike that. Let me go off the record for					
3	a second.					
4	(Whereupon, the above-entitled					
5	matter went off the record at 2:53 p.m. and					
6	resumed at 2:54 p.m.)					
7	MR. OSHINSKY: On the record.					
8	THE WITNESS: Besozzi prepared an					
9	affidavit for me to sign. I think it was with					
10	respect to the first one. I'm not sure, but					
11	I'm pretty sure that's right. Then I did read					
12	it and decided it was I believe it					
13	submitted as part of the response, so					
14	MR. OSHINSKY: Okay. Ms. Singh is					
15	going to go through all that with you.					
16	THE WITNESS: Okay. All right.					
17	MS. SINGH: I'll interject now for					
18	just a minute, if I can.					
19	MR. OSHINSKY: Okay.					
20	BY MS. SINGH:					
21	Q You just said off the record and					
22	was this something that you just consulted					

1	with your attorney about and were able to				
2	answer?				
3	A Yes. He remembered that we'd gone				
4	over this on				
5	Q Okay.				
6	A Yes. He was correct.				
7	Q Thank you.				
8	A I just forgot about it.				
9	MS. SINGH: Thank you.				
10	MR. OSHINSKY: Okay.				
11	BY MR. OSHINSKY:				
12	Q Can you tell us about the waiver				
13	request which was filed on behalf of PAI in				
14	relation to the auction licenses, auction 34				
15	licenses.				
16	A Don't know much about that.				
17	Q You were not involved in that?				
18	A No, sir. I was told they were				
19	going to do that, about a day or two before it				
20	was filed. That's all I know. That's all I				
21	know about that.				
22	Q What was your understanding about				

1	why they were doing it?				
2	A I don't understand why they did it.				
3	Today, I don't understand why they did it.				
4	Q You understood they were up against				
5	some construction deadlines?				
6	A Oh, yes. That's why we were				
7	raising money out in California. But I had				
8	thought that what they were going to do was				
9	basically, in my conversations with Mr.				
10	Calderon and Matt, they were in fact going to				
11	get the licenses constructed and meet the				
12	substantial service requirement.				
13	Q And how long did that				
14	understanding, your understanding of that				
15	persist? In other words, did there come a				
16	time when you realized that they weren't going				
17	to be doing that?				
18	A When they told me they were going				
19	to file for a waiver instead. December of				
20	2005.				
21	Q So was it your understanding that				
22	up to December of 2005 they I mean, you've				

told us that you didn't believe they were 1 anything constructing 2 doina towards an 3 licenses, operating operating set of or 4 network. 5 You must have, at some realized that they have to do something. 6 were aware of the construction deadline, were 7 8 you not? 9 Well, if I gave you the impression 10 they weren't doing anything towards building and operating a commercial system, 11 12 that was correct. I understood what they were 13 doing in terms of trying to get the licenses 14 preserved and to meet the minimum 15 construction standard. What did you understand them to be 16 17 doing then? Well, I knew that Preferred had 18 Ά hired Concepts To Operations, Inc., and then 19 Alex was involved and he had a number of 20 21 subcontractors. They'd gotten site leases in

all the markets and they'd ordered equipment,

1	and a lot of the equipment's in a warehouse,					
2	and they managed to work through some third					
3	party firms and compile a lot of equipment.					
4	And they were in a position either					
5	to met the substantial service requirement or					
6	certainly qualify for grant of a waiver.					
7	But my understanding was they'd					
8	done enough to be able to, in November,					
9	December, to get the licenses on the air and					
10	meet the substantial service requirement.					
11	Q And when you say get the licenses					
12	on the air, what do you mean?					
13	A Deploy equipment, install					
14	equipment, test equipment, send out a					
15	continuous signal to meet the substantial					
16	you know, cover a certain percentage of the					
17	population of each market.					
18	Q And your understanding in December					
19	of 2005 was that they were in a position to do					
20	that?					
21	A Yes, sir.					
22	Q And so when they filed for a					

+	warver, ende was a comprete surprise to you.
2	A I was shocked, yes, I was shocked.
3	Q And did you have anything to say
4	about it?
5	A Yes. I had a few things to say
6	about it.
7	Q What did you say? What did you
8	tell Mr. Austin?
9	A What in the bleep do you think
10	you're doing, man? What are you doing?
11	Q And what was his response?
12	A He thought that was the best thing
13	to do. He never explained why. He just
14	that was his decision. He made the decision.
15	That's what he's going to do.
16	Q And did you ask him at that time
17	why he wasn't orienting himself towards
18	operate, actually operating?
19	A No. I was just cursing, is what I
20	was
21	Q Just cursing?
22	A Just cursing.

1 Q Okay. 2 You know, we spent a year almost, Α raising a whole lot of money and sent him the 3 whole money, and the whole point of doing that 4 5 was to get the licenses on the air to meet the substantial service requirement. He calls up, 6 7 out of the blue, and tells us that he's not going to do that. So we weren't real happy. 8 9 Alex wasn't real happy either. 10 What was your -- I'm sorry, 0 go 11 I didn't mean to cut you off. ahead. No, it's just -- you know -- look, 12 Α I lived in an 13 man, we've busted our butts. extended stay America Place for 11 months, 14 15 and, you know, flying around and doing all kinds of things, and we didn't understand why 16 we couldn't finish, why we couldn't get the 17 18 thing -- you know -- get it done. 19 So was your expectation that 20 2006 you guys were going to have an operating 21 system?

I thought about in 2006 all the

Α

1	licenses would have been constructed to meet					
2	the substantial service requirement. You					
3	could go forward from there. Yes.					
4	Q What would going forward mean?					
5	A Building a major wireless					
6	communication system in Puerto Rico and the					
7	Virgin Islands.					
8	Q Had you done all of the things					
9	necessary to make that system work in 2006?					
10	A No, we hadn't, but not as of					
11	December 2005. But, you know, the whole point					
12	was if you didn't preserve the licenses, you					
13	didn't have anything, and that was our goal					
14	for the 2005 year. We thought we'd made that.					
15	We thought we'd accomplished that goal, and we					
16	were told at the last minute, no, we didn't do					
17	that. We're going to file for a waiver					
18	instead.					
19	Q Well, wasn't he preserving the					
20	licenses by filing for the waiver?					
21	A But that's not what we wanted to					
22	do.					

What did you envision the next step 1 0 2 being after December of 2005? Well, assuming that preserved the 3 through meeting the substantial 4 licenses service requirement, then all the things that 5 would have, we would have laid out in, say, 6 the memo to Patel back in 2003, the memo that 7 wasn't sent, the company was going to do all 8 9 those things. The company had five goals for 10 11 2005, and it didn't meet a single one of them. Can you tell us what the five were. 12 Well, number one was all the status 13 Α 14 of the auction 34 loans with the Patel family. 15 Number two, get certified financial statements 16 prepared. Number three, getting operating 17 system appraisal, which wasn't done. Number -- one of the things was meeting substantial 18 19 service requirement, and I think the other one 20 was probably getting a search firm, and 21 beginning the process of bringing on real

strong people on the board of directors.

1	Q All right. I'm going to ask you				
2	one more question. Then I think we're going				
3	to take a break for a few minutes. Had what				
4	you envisioned, or what you wanted, been				
5	accomplished in 2005, what was the next step				
6	for you, in your mind?				
7	A Well, basically, when				
8	Q Because you need to and I guess				
9	what I'm getting at is were you moving on to				
10	getting customers for your network? Or were				
11	you moving on to getting more money in order				
12	to either acquire additional licenses or				
13	something like that?				
14	A Well, you were going to have to				
15	raise more money, obviously. But you were				
16	looking at an executive search firm. You were				
17	looking at revising your business plan. You				
18	were looking at raising money. You were				
19	looking at acquiring additional spectrum.				
20	Positioning the company so it could move				

forward and build a major system in Puerto

Rico.

21

1	MR. OSHINSKY: All right. I'm					
2	going to propose that we take about a ten					
3	minute break right at this time, so I can make					
4	an assessment of how we're going to proceed,					
5	and why don't we come back at about ten after.					
6	Is that good for everybody?					
7	MS. SINGH: Off the record.					
8	(Whereupon, the above-entitled					
9	matter went off the record from 3:02 p.m. and					
10	resumed at 3:16 p.m. under Sealed Testimony.)					
11						
12						
13						
14						
15						
16						
17						
18						
19						
20						
21						

1	ł		1	l
A	acquisition 255:5	afield 23:19 25:11	alert 258:10	anti-trafficking
abandoned 14:8	Acquisitions 1:12	afraid 52:6	Alex 187:21 188:6	83:16
15:2 70:18	2:10 189:21 193:9	aftermarket	188:8,10,11	anybody 112:4,6
ability 185:11,18	212:5 223:22	255:11	189:10 227:16	222:18 224:22
able 10:21 66:17	253:11	afternoon 53:16	267:20 270:9	235:19 238:19
107:9 112:12	acquitted 48:2	afterward 219:7	alleged 56:12	240:9
139:3 161:14	acted 198:21 199:4	<b>Agency</b> 2:2 3:8	allow 53:19 114:18	anymore 54:22
163:22 180:20	acting 81:15	agnostic 250:9	114:19,20	55:1 174:22 175:3
195:14 218:9	222:22	ago 3:22,22 4:2	<b>allowed</b> 39:6 57:6,7	anyway 120:5
219:15 261:6	action 40:8 41:15	10:12,12	74:22 75:2	190:14 191:14
265:1 268:8	64:20 75:19	agree 11:6 109:9	ally 205:22	apart 152:15
above-entitled 22:2	141:16 143:13	188:6 190:5 198:7	alternative 79:12	Apartment 12:13
76:3 134:6 173:22	actions 41:5	198:8 199:19	America 270:14	apparent 78:15
184:19 202:2	active 116:6	244:17	amount 22:10	197:8
264:4 274:8	activities 60:16	agreed 6:11 110:10	51:14 92:12 110:2	apparently 41:16
absolutely 74:20	114:17 159:12	186:17 188:11	147:6,16 150:5	53:14 55:5 120:11
97:8 148:11	225:8 260:3	199:7 202:20	178:8,9,10,12	129:2
accept 206:14	261:20	218:20 239:10	199:17 217:15	appeal 59:3 129:20
210:17	activity 223:8	agreement 19:11	amounted 216:7	appealing 63:16
acceptable 210:4	actual 40:16	71:11 78:8,18	analogous 111:6	93:6
accepted 186:10	237:12 256:13,15	79:21 89:5 90:16	analogue 249:22	APPEARANCES
accepting 59:6	ad 233:18,19,22	107:13 109:11	analysis 85:9	2:1
access 57:22	239:11	130:9 149:16,17	190:13 192:12	Appellate 24:3
207:19 219:11	add 10:14 18:4	149:17,18 150:1,2	227:19	application 24:17
accident 50:11	addition 80:12	151:22 152:5,7,8	ancillary 138:2	25:7 29:12 79:10
accomplished	additional 81:3	152:14,16 155:8	Andrew 203:7	80:9 93:2 98:13
252:11 271:15	214:17 246:18	155:10,11 156:22	and/or 4:4 31:2	182:13 183:10
273:5	249:5 273:12,19	158:2,5 166:16	92:13 204:22	applications 26:8,9
account 145:12	address 12:11	172:10 177:3	244:13	26:19 31:1 38:10
146:9	226:7	178:5,11 198:5	Angeles 44:10	49:1 91:21 98:6
accountant 33:17	addressed 250:13	205:4 211:7,16,16	210:15	98:11,14 128:7
210:14	adjacent 201:12	239:4,16	<b>Anjali</b> 2:3 3:11 9:4	181:18 182:10
accounting 146:5	administrative	agreements 69:22	11:11	255:12,13
146:19 210:10	61:3,5 64:7	74:2,13 83:5	anjali.singh@fcc	appointments
245:6	111:11 114:22	152:1,7 176:18	2:8	101:3
	231:16 232:17	210:20	answer 7:20 8:3,10	appoints 102:7,9
accruing 163:16	233:2	ahead 17:21 19:2	10:5,6,9,11,14,17	appraisal 272:17
accurate 132:9	adopt 226:13	33:1 40:19 70:5	10:19 11:15 12:4	appreciate 39:19
209:8	ads 234:4	80:16 84:6 111:8	185:11,19 197:2	50:15
accurately 80:18	advance 51:20	143:3 162:10	252:13,15,15	approach 190:9
acquiesced 148:10	advanced 250:16	172:16 203:2	258:17,22 259:17	195:7 214:5 226:4
acquire 90:22	advancing 205:16	214:10 220:2	259:19 263:15,19	226:6,13,16,17
153:21 154:11	advertise 238:19	226:10 250:10	265:2	approached 52:18
182:7,14 250:15	advertisers 237:16	251:8,12 270:11	answered 22:15	99:13
273:12	advertising 233:14	air 187:20 268:9,12	35:2 97:6,13	appropriate 69:14
acquired 38:19	237:12	270:5	122:20	163:12
84:2 135:15	affect 185:10,18	Akin 124:3	answering 11:1	approved 194:13
138:12 196:1	affidavit 264:9	Alabama 193:7	answers 7:18 10:10	approximately
204:21 218:13	affiliated 54:16	alcoholic 11:17	36:5	28:18 166:1,21
acquiring 255:9,10 273:19	affinity 47:11	185:15	answer's 43:4	189:1 203:18
2/3:19				
L	-			